

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 17 2007**Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736**REMARKS****Present Status of the Application**

The Office Action rejected all presently-pending claims 1-29. Specifically, the Office Action rejected claims 3 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uehara et al. (U.S. 4,772,885) (hereinafter Uehara).

The Office Action rejected claims 2 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara in view of Nakabayashi (US 6,379,017).

The Office Action rejected claims 3-4 and 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara in view of Ciupke (US 5,485,354).

The Office Action rejected claims 5 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara in view of Ciupke and further in view of Nakabayashi.

The Office Action rejected claims 8-9 and 17-18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara in view of Morozumi (US 4,600,274).

The Office Action rejected claims 12, 23 and 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara in view of Asai (US 6,166,713).

The Office Action rejected claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uehara in view of Lee (US 2003/014060).

Applicants submit that independent claims 1 and 10 have been

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****JAN 17 2007**Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736

amended, claims 30-37 are newly added, and dependent claims 6-7, 9, 15-16 have been amended to improve clarity and in accordance with the dependency accordingly changed thereto, dependent claims 8 and 17 have been canceled, dependent claims 4 and 9 have been amended for correction of informalities as instructed by the Examiner while the other claims remain unchanged as originally filed. All changes to the claims are fully supported by the originally filed claims, disclosure and the drawings. For at least the following reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7, 9-16 and 18-37 are in proper condition for allowance. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Discussion of Claim Rejections under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Applicants have amended claims 4 and 5 to provide the antecedent base for "the light diffusing surface" and "the linear light source".

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 102(b)

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 6, 7, 10, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Uehara. In response thereto, Applicants have amended claims 1, and 10, and hereby otherwise traverse these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

The features are recited in claims 1 and 10. For example, independent claim 1 recited the features.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736

With respect to claim 1, independent claim 1 recites the features as follows:

1. A back light module for providing a full-color surface light source, comprising:
a surface light source providing a first color light;
...
a fluorescent layer formed inside some of the lattice points, comprising:
a plurality of first fluorescent-based material for converting the first color light into a second color light; and
a plurality of second fluorescent-based material for converting the first color light into a third color light,
wherein the first color light passing through uncoated lattice points.
... (Emphasis added)

Claim 10 also recite the similar features.

Uehara (col. 9, lines 14-28) discloses, "a fluorescent layer 143 comprising a mosaic-patterned pixel fluorescent body 144 composed of pixel fluorescent elements 144a, 144b, 144c aligned with the color filter elements 142a, 142b, 143c and the pixel electrode elements 21." Uehara does not teach the features of "a surface light source providing a first color light", "the fluorescent layer comprising first fluorescent-based materials for converting the first color light into a second color light, and second fluorescent-based materials for converting the first color light into a third color light", and "the first color light passing through uncoated lattice points." Moreover, the pixel fluorescent elements 144a, 144b, 144c disclosed in Uehara reference are all disposed in the fluorescent layer 143, but the present invention (as shown in Fig. 4) teaches the linear light source produce light of a particular color

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736

such as blue, and only the fluorescent-based material 230b and 230c are formed inside some of the lattice points for converting blue light into red light or green light, respectively. The Uehara fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "a fluorescent layer formed inside some of the lattice points, comprising: a plurality of first fluorescent-based material for converting the first color light into a second color light; and a plurality of second fluorescent-based material for converting the first color light into a third color light, wherein the first color light passing through uncoated lattice points".

Morozumi, Ciupke, Nakabayashi, Asai and Lee also do not disclose features as recited in independent claim 1 of the present invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits Uehara, Morozumi, Ciupke, Nakabayashi, Asai and LeeMandal fail to teach or suggest the limitation of "a fluorescent layer formed inside some of the lattice points, comprising: a plurality of first fluorescent-based material for converting the first color light into a second color light; and a plurality of second fluorescent-based material for converting the first color light into a third color light, wherein the first color light passing through uncoated lattice points", and thus the references combined do not teach or suggest each and every element claims 1, and 10. Therefore, independent claims 1, and 10 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 6, 7, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22, 24 and 28 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law.

The features are recited in newly added independent claim 30.

With respect to claim 30, independent claim 30 recites the features as

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736

follows:

30. A back light module for providing a full-color surface light source, comprising:

...

a light-shielding matrix formed on the surface of the surface light source, wherein the light-shielding matrix has a plurality of lattice points that exposes the underlying surface light source; and

...

... (Emphasis added)

Uehara (col. 9, lines 14-28) discloses, "a fluorescent layer 143 comprising a mosaic-patterned pixel fluorescent body 144 composed of pixel fluorescent elements 144a, 144b, 144c aligned with the color filter elements 142a, 142b, 143c and the pixel electrode elements 21." Uehara does not teach the pixel fluorescent elements 144a, 144b, 144c are disposed in the light-shielding matrix. Moreover, the pixel fluorescent elements 144a, 144b, 144c disclosed in Uehara reference are disposed in the fluorescent layer 143, but the present invention teaches the fluorescent-based material 230a, 230b and 230c are mainly disposed in the light-shielding matrix. The fluorescent layer 143 is different from the light-shielding matrix. The Uehara fails to teach or suggest the limitation of "a light-shielding matrix formed on the surface of the surface light source, wherein the light-shielding matrix has a plurality of lattice points that exposes the underlying surface light source, and a fluorescent layer formed inside the lattice points".

Morozumi, Ciupke, Nakabayashi, Asai and Lee also do not disclose features as recited in independent claim 30 of the present invention.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736

For at least the foregoing reasons, applicant respectfully submits Uehara, Morozumi, Ciupke, Nakabayashi, Asai and LeeMandal fail to teach or suggest the limitation of "*a light-shielding matrix formed on the surface of the surface light source, wherein the light-shielding matrix has a plurality of lattice points that exposes the underlying surface light source, and a fluorescent layer formed inside the lattice points*", and thus the references combined do not teach or suggest each and every element claim 30. Therefore, independent claim 30 patently define over the prior art references, and should be allowed. For at least the same reasons, dependent claims 31-37 patently define over the prior art as a matter of law. Applicant submits that newly added claims 30-37 are now in condition for allowance.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 103(a)

The Office Action rejected claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, 21, 23, 25-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

In response, Applicant submits that claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, 21, 23, 25-27 are now in condition for allowance.

If independent claims 1 and 10 are allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claims 2-5, 9, 11-14, 18, 21, 23, 25-27 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claims 1 and 10.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FAX NO.

P. 21/21

JAN 17 2007

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 10653-US-PA
Application No.: 10/707,736CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

Jan. 17, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@icipgroup.com.tw
Usa@icipgroup.com.tw